

EXHIBIT 99

REDACTED

Subject: Re: Privacy Chat

GOOG-DOJ-29427368

+ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for continuity

I have one potentially naive question.....Can we delay the roll out of the new [REDACTED] until we have the [REDACTED] product ready to take to market? I'm guessing that would mean [REDACTED] to protect us from other [REDACTED] while allowing [REDACTED] to maintain their current business operations.

Thoughts?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Google, Inc.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This e-mail is confidential. If you are not the right addressee please do not forward it, please inform the sender, and please erase this e-mail including any attachments.

The above comments and terms reflect a potential business arrangement, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and are not intended to be and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 1:37 PM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

Agreed on all the points made here and the next step. [REDACTED] will take the lead on sharing the briefing up the GBO chain . Thank you everyone for all the time spent on this. Really appreciate all the work that has gone into from all teams involved.

Best

[REDACTED]

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 1:13 PM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

[REDACTED] and I will prepare a note for [REDACTED], borrowing heavily from the briefing doc [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] prepared (thank you!)

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 12:36 PM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

Thanks all.

From a partnerships perspective, agree with yes, no, no, no - with the caveat on #4 - "On a related note, do we think not engaging is likely to make the relationship with [REDACTED] worse than it already is?" [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] While the relationship is quite contentious already, I do think this will affect the partnership. I don't think that is a reason to change course, just flagging it.

[REDACTED], agree on escalating. At the end of our call with [REDACTED] shared that she was going to escalate to her CEO [REDACTED], and we expect he will reach out to our team. I am working on

cleaning up resolved comments in the briefing doc now, and then on our side will send it to [REDACTED] who will share it up the Partnerships / GBO chain.

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 12:27 PM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Thank you all for spending so much time on this.

I agree with [REDACTED] "yes, no, no, no". Everytime we meet with [REDACTED] it's the same accusations and finger pointing, followed by an ask for lawyers to discuss, followed by twitter rants and ultimately PR cycle.

I would like to explore the [REDACTED] but I expect that won't be enough to satisfy [REDACTED] anyway.

Since this is all very heated should we escalate to [REDACTED] etc? so that the don't hear about this from [REDACTED]?
[REDACTED]

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 11:24 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
[REDACTED]

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 11:23 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL

+ a few folks

Context for the others (briefing doc here): We had a call with [REDACTED] yesterday, where they reacted violently to the changes in the Bid DT file (where [REDACTED]). They weren't completely convinced by the user privacy protection narrative, and would like to set up a call between their lawyers and ours to chat more about it. [REDACTED]

Redacted - Privilege

Redacted - Privilege

[Thinking aloud] I think the considerations re. whether to engage or not on [REDACTED] request (email below) are as follows:

1. Do we think having another conversation between their lawyers and ours potentially [REDACTED] or points we bring up?

2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

My impression is the answer to these questions are [yes, no, no, no] respectively. We've met our obligation to communicate the changes to the partner. Even if we do engage, I don't believe the risk of negative PR changes materially.

Redacted - Privilege

Redacted - Privilege

buyers. I don't think we should completely stay silent on the user privacy angle given we've already been leaning on it, esp. in the press articles that went out last week. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Thoughts?

Agree that we should evaluate [REDACTED], so not sure we'd have something to say re. the feasibility of that change immediately.

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 11:17 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Privileged and Confidential

[REDACTED]
We are currently investigating if we can add data to the file to meet their use cases (ie highest competing HB line item price).

[REDACTED]
On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 11:04 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
+ [REDACTED]

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 10:14 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Thanks [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] for visibility

On Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 10:09 AM [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Privileged and Confidential

Redacted - Privilege